DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 118 CG 020 051

AUTHOR Schnell, Steven; Gibbs, John C.
TITLE Delinquents with Mature Moral Reasoning: A Comparison with Delayed Delinquents and Mature Nondelinquents.
PUB DATE 25 Apr 87
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development (Baltimore, MD, April 23-26, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; *Antisocial Behavior; *Delinquency; *Developmental Stages; *Moral Development; *Moral Values; Prisoners; Psychopathology; Value Judgment
IDENTIFIERS Kohlberg (Lawrence)

ABSTRACT

Kohlberg's developmental theory of moral reasoning hypothesizes that the socially unacceptable moral behavior of many juvenile delinquents is related to immature moral reasoning. A sizeable minority of delinquents, however, has been shown to reason at age-appropriate levels. This study examined issues related to those juvenile delinquents who were mature in moral reasoning in terms of Kohlberg's (1983) theory of sociomoral development. Incarcerated delinquents (N=43) with age-appropriate moral reasoning (Kohlberg's Stage 3) were compared with incarcerated delinquents (N=42) delayed in moral reasoning and with nondelinquents (N=35) with age-appropriate moral reasoning. All subjects completed the Sociomoral Reflection Measure, Johnson's Values Questionnaire, a shortened version of the Personal Values Questionnaire, the Quick Word Test, and a measure of socioeconomic status. In addition, the delinquent subjects also completed the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). The results revealed that both delinquent groups evidenced a greater acceptance of antisocial behavior and values than did nondelinquents. Both delayed and mature delinquent groups also demonstrated much psychopathology. However, mature delinquents evidenced MMPI scores reflecting more internalizing pathology than did delayed delinquents. This internalizing pathology may reflect the anxiety or guilt resulting from the strain between mature moral structure and antisocial behavior or a parallel between sociomoral structures and personality/psychopathology. (Author/NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED284118

Delinquents With Mature Moral Reasoning: A Comparison With Delayed Delinquents and Mature Nondelinquents

Steven Schnell and John C. Gibbs

The Ohio State University

Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society For Research In Child Development, April 25, 1987; Baltimore.

The first author is currently at North Memorial Medical Center, Child Guidance Clinic, 3401 Oakdale N., Minneapolis, MN 55422.

CG 020057

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Steven Schnell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

The present study provides empirically based insights into a theoretically anomalous group of juvenile delinquents, namely, those mature in moral reasoning in terms of Kohlberg's (1983) theory of sociomoral development. Forty-three incarcerated delinquents with age-appropriate moral reasoning (stage 3) were compared with 42 incarcerated delinquents delayed in moral reasoning and 35 nondelinquents with age-appropriate moral reasoning. Both delinquent groups evidenced a greater acceptance of antisocial behavior and values than the nondelinquents. Both delayed and mature delinquent groups also demonstrated much psychopathology. However, mature delinquents evidenced MMPI scores reflecting more internalizing pathology than the delayed delinquents. This internalizing pathology may reflect the anxiety or guilt resulting from the strain between mature moral structures and antisocial behavior, or, a parallel between sociomoral structures and personality/psychopathology.

Delinquents With Mature Moral Reasoning: A Comparison With Delayed Delinquents and Mature Nondelinquents

Kohlberg's developmental theory of moral reasoning hypothesizes that the socially unacceptable moral decisions and behavior of many juvenile delinquents are related to the immature and inadequate manner in which they conceptualize their environments and reason about moral situations. This cognitive-developmental theory of moral development does not claim that immature moral reasoning causes delinquency, only that it can be consistent with delinquent behavior. The bases of stage 2 moral reasoning -- instrumental self-interest, pragmatic exchanges, and the inability to take a third-person perspective -- result in a conditional upholding of values: values are upheld when they are advantageous to the individual but tend to be transgressed when they are detrimental to self-interest (Gibbs, Arnold, Ahlborn, & Cheesman, 1984). More mature moral reasoning "insulates" one against delinquent behavior (Jennings, Kilkenny, & Kohlberg, 1983, p. 311) or provides a "cognitive buffer against antisocial influences and temptations" (Gibbs et al., 1984, p. 37). This "buffer" is provided by the justification of norms on such bases as mutual interpersonal expectations, empathic role-taking, and consideration of interpersonal approval.

Despite the fact that delinquents, as a group, reason at a level below that of nondelinquent peers, a sizeable minority of delinquents reason at an age-appropriate level (Jennings et al., 1983). The question arises as to how Kohlberg's theory can account for these nondelayed delinquents. This is an important issue for the theory to address and, yet, one which has received little attention (Jennings et al., 1983; Jurkovic, 1980). Jennings et al. (1983) state that "If moral judgment is necessary, [for consistent moral behavior] what other conditions are required for sufficiency? This question is the least explored and most problematic for moral psychology. It is also the most crucial for anyone contemplating applying theory in practice" (p. 292).

Kohlberg's stages of moral reasoning are not defined as stages of action, but rather as cognitive-developmental structures that are consistent with cognitive development. Changes in stage definition over the years have attempted to separate content from structure and have resulted in a developmental model of cognitive-structural development that has strong empirical support (Colby, Kohlberg, Gibbs, and Lieberman, 1983). However, as noted by Colby (1978), the core structures that are studied by Kohlberg have become more abstract and formal and as a result are further from "real-life" moral conduct and personality. Kohlberg and Kramer (1969) admit that a structural model requires

"abstraction from life history". This abstraction has been most productive in describing the development of cognitive structures related to moral reasoning. The price paid for abstraction, however, has been a greater distance from many factors that mediate judgment and action.

Values

It has been argued that the content of moral reasoning, along with the structure of moral reasoning, is related to behavior (Blasi, 1983; Kuhn, 1978). Jurkovic (1980) states that "moral content (e.g., tolerance of deviancy) may account for a significant proportion of the variance in moral (delinquent) conduct that is not captured by moral structure alone" (p. 723).

Little empirical data are available concerning the values of stage 3 delinquents. Based on a number of factors, however, mature (age-appropriate moral reasoning) delinquents can be expected to accept antisocial behaviors and values to a greater extent than mature nondelinquents. First, delinquents, as a group, have been found to embrace antisocial values to a greater extent than nondelinquents (Cernkovich, 1978). Second, antisocial values would be more consistent with the delinquents' behavior than socially acceptable values. Third, if stage 3 reasoners are more likely to experience guilt and anxiety in response to conflicts between expectations and their actual behavior, then the acceptance of values that allow for antisocial

behavior would serve the defensive purpose of reducing guilt and anxiety.

If values are important determinants of behavior as noted above, then it is plausible that they could overpower the influence of moral structures and help to account for the antisocial behavior of mature delinquents. A comparison can be made to Atayal adolescents' regressive beliefs about dreams. Kohlberg (1969) did not view these beliefs as the result of structural regression, but rather as learning superimposed on mature structures. Thus, through deviant socialization, antisocial values may be superimposed on the mature sociomoral structures of some delinquents.

Psychopathology

Personality or emotional factors are often thought to mediate the relationship between social-cognitive structures and behavior (Blasi, 1980; Noam, 1985; Selman, 1980). Many studies have explored this relationship (Dobert & Nunner-Winkler, 1985; Haan, 1978; Jurkovic, 1980; Noam et al., 1984; Selman & Demorest, 1984; Villenave-Cremer & Eckensberger, 1985; Ward & Wilson, 1980; Waterman, Sobesky, Silvern, Aoli, & McCaulay, 1981). The relationship between juvenile delinquency and psychopathology is also generally accepted (see Marshall, 1983). It seems likely that the antisocial behavior of mature delinquents is related to psychopathology, with the psychopathology, like values, overriding the mature moral structures.

It is anticipated that mature delinquents will evidence a high level of psychopathology and that this pathology will be of an internalizing, neurotic type. The hypothesis of greater internalizing pathology in mature delinquents is based on both empirical and theoretical considerations. Studies have found a correlation between level of moral reasoning and guilt (Douglas et al., 1987; Ruma & Mosher, 1966). In addition, the strain between mature moral structures and antisocial behavior is hypothesized to result in anxiety and guilt that will be reflected in internalizing pathology. Also, internalizing pathology, versus externalizing pathology, is consistent more with the internal focus of stage 3 reasoning, versus stage 2 reasoning.

Individuals at stage 3 perceive others "in the context of shared role expectations in personalized relationships" (Kohlberg, Levine, & Hewer, 1983, p. 42). Prosocial feelings, mutual relationships, intentions, and expectations play an important role in judgments. Because of this focus, stage 3 moral reasoning is difficult to reconcile with antisocial values and behavior. Therefore, stage 3 reasoners who engage in antisocial behavior or embrace antisocial values likely encounter cognitive dissonance that may result in anxiety or guilt. In addition to the conflict resulting from the mature structure/antisocial behavior strain, greater conflict is anticipated at stage 3 because

self-centered desires often come into conflict with social expectations and empathic responses. Individuals at stage 3 moral reasoning uphold values in a more consistent manner than individuals at stage 2 moral reasoning and therefore have greater difficulty justifying transgressions based on self-interest. If the anxiety or guilt resulting from these conflicts is severe enough, it should be expressed as neurotic or internalizing psychopathology.

Three hypothesizes are addressed by this study. First, that mature delinquents will endorse antisocial values to a greater extent than mature nondelinquents. Second, that mature delinquents will demonstrate a greater degree of psychopathology than mature nondelinquents. Third, that mature delinquents will demonstrate a greater amount of internalizing psychopathology than delayed delinquents. These hypotheses will be evaluated by comparing incarcerated delinquents with mature moral reasoning with incarcerated delinquents with delayed moral reasoning and nondelinquents with mature moral reasoning.

Method

Subjects

Delinquent subjects. The delinquent subjects were all adjudicated male youths who were incarcerated in locked state facilities in a midwestern state. All had been convicted of at least one felony and most had lengthy

criminal records. Subjects were solicited at two juvenile facilities. All individuals between the ages of 15 and 17 with at least a fourth grade reading level were asked to take part in the study. These ages were used because it was felt that they would provide large numbers of both stage 2 and stage 3 delinquents.

One hundred and thirty-three juveniles met the age and reading level requirements. Of this number, 113 chose to take part in the study. Sixteen failed to complete the study because they were released, transferred, escaped, or failured to respond seriously to the study. Ninty-seven subjects completed the entire experiment. The results of ten subjects who completed the study were not used in the data analysis because of unscorable Sociomoral Reflection Measures (SRM; 5) and invalid MMPI protocols (5; based on MMPI profile configurations that resembled random responding protocols).

The delinquent sample ranged in age from 15.3 to 17.9 with a mean of 16.6. Thirty-three subjects (38%) were from large urban areas (over 100,000 population) with the remaining 53 (62%) being from more rural areas. Seventy-four subjects (86%) were caucasians and 12 (14%) were black. Based on the Revised Duncan Socioeconomic Index (Stevens & Featherman, 1981), the delinquent sample's SES ratings ranged from 14 to 83 with a mean of 28.3. Examples of occupations of parents typical of scores close to the

mean are mechanic (25), key-punch operator (32) and hair stylist (26).

Forty subjects (47%) had been previously placed in youth training facilities. Twenty-one of the delinquent subjects (24%) had committed crimes against persons (e.g., assault). Twenty-six subjects (30%) had at some time been convicted of crimes associated with drugs or had received treatment related to the use of drugs. Approximately 60% were currently incarcerated because of theft related offenses (e.g., grand theft, breaking and entering).

Many subjects were dropped from analyses that involved covarying SES or Quick Word Test (QW) scores because of missing data. SES data were lacking for 19 delinquent subjects. Most of these subjects' parents were not working and could not be given an SES rating. Fourteen subjects did not have QW scores. These subjects either did not complete the QW or responded in a random manner.

Based on Chi-square analyses, subjects without SES scores were not disproportionally represented in the mature or delayed delinquent groups. Subjects without QW scores were represented to a greater degree in the delayed delinquency group, X (1,43)=4.96, $p<.05$ (Yates correction used). This may have added a bias into the comparison of delayed and mature delinquents in which QW was covaried and also may have weakened the ecological validity of the results.

Nondelinquent subjects. The nondelinquent subjects attended a public high school in a rural area of the Midwest. A random sample of 50 male tenth, eleventh, and twelfth graders were asked to take part in the study. Forty-two subjects chose to participate. All subjects completed the study.

The nondelinquent subjects ranged in age from 15.5 to 18.9 with a mean of 17.0 years. All subjects were caucasians from rural areas. Based on the Revised Duncan Socioeconomic Index the nondelinquent sample's SES ratings ranged from 18 to 77 with a mean of 46.1. Examples of occupations of parents close to the mean are medical secretary (44), construction manager (40), and insurance agent (54).

The principal of the high school was unaware of any subject who had been incarcerated for a felony. Four subjects (10%) admitted to having been convicted of breaking the law. Two of these were described as misdemeanors and two were theft. School files contained no indication of serious behavior problems at school. Two subjects were dropped from the study because their SRM's were unscorable.

Procedures

Delinquent sample. Most subjects were tested in two sessions. Each session had a ten minute soda and cigarette break. Those who were unable to complete the material in the two sessions or missed part or all of one of the

sessions (approximately 30%) returned for a third session. Subjects were tested in groups that ranged from 17 to 30 for the first two sessions and from 5 to 21 for the third session.

Nondelinquent sample. The nondelinquent subjects completed the same measures as the delinquent subjects with the exception of the MMPI. Time constraints on the availability of the nondelinquent subjects and the availability of relevant MMPI norms resulted in the dropping of the MMPI for the nondelinquent sample.

All subjects were tested in two sessions. Subjects were given fruit drinks during the second session to approximate the incentives provided the delinquent subjects.

Measures

Measure of moral reasoning. The Sociomoral Reflection Measure (SRM; Gibbs & Widaman, 1982) is a production task that provides a measure of reflective sociomoral reasoning. The SRM functions as a group-administrable alternative to Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview (MJI). Two types of scores reflecting the level of moral reasoning are calculated. The modal stage score is the most frequently used stage and it ranges from one to four. The Sociomoral Reflection Maturity Score (SRMS) reflects reasoning at the modal level and other levels, with possible scores ranging from 100 to 400. Another score, the global score, is a developmental categorization of the SRMS. Acceptable levels

of test-retest, parallel-form, interrater, internal consistency, and concurrent validity with the MJI have been demonstrated (Gibbs, Widaman, & Colby, 1982).

The norms provided by Gibbs et al.(1979) were used as guidelines for expected level of moral reasoning as measured by the SRM. Predominately stage 3 moral reasoning or above can be considered age-appropriate (labelled as "mature" in this study) for the subjects in this study.

Both modal scores and global scores were used. For modal scores, mature moral reasoning was defined as a modal stage score of 3 or above. Delayed moral reasoning was defined as modal stage 2 reasoning. For global scores mature moral reasoning was defined as global stage 3 or above (SRMS of 275 or above). Delayed moral reasoning was defined as all scores below global stage 3 (global 3(2) and below; SRMS of less than 275). Unless otherwise stated, all results are based on the use of global scores.

Measure of personality. The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) is an objective, self-report measure of personality. It is an instrument that is commonly used in the study of crime and delinquency (Butcher & Tellegen, 1978; Lanyon, 1968). Studies have shown the MMPI to differentiate between delinquent and nondelinquent samples (Lanyon, 1968), and, of special relevance to the present study, to differentiate between neurotic and psychopathic delinquents (Genshaft, 1980; Gregory, 1974).

The norms of Marks, Seeman, and Haller (1974) were used for the three validity scales and the ten clinical scales. Adolescent norms are not provided for Es, R, Mac, and A scales and therefore raw scores were used in the analyses. No profiles were eliminated because of high F scale scores. This is recommended by Gynther (1961) and McKegney (1965) and consistent with recent studies of adolescents using the MMPI (Genshaft, 1980; Marks et al., 1974).

Measures of values. Two measures of values were used. Johnson's (1979) Values Questionnaire (JVQ) consists of rating six behaviors on how often each is acceptable. The possible responses range from zero to four. The score consists of the sum of the responses with a high score indicating the acceptance of antisocial behavior.

The second questionnaire was Segrave & Hastad's (1983). This is a shortened version of the Personal Values Questionnaire (Cernkovich, 1978) that measures "subterranean" and "conventional" value orientations. Subterranean value orientation supports short-run hedonism, thrills, toughness, and the ability to con or dupe others. Conventional value orientation includes the valuing of deferred gratification, hard work, practicality, progress, and secular rationality. The subterranean values questionnaire (SVQ) consists of 24 statements. Subjects are asked to rate the degree to which they agree with each statement on a five-point scale ranging from "strongly

agree" to "strongly disagree." The higher the score, the greater the acceptance of a subterranean values orientation.

Measure of intelligence. The Quick Word Test (QW; Borgatta & Corsini, 1960) is a multiple choice, group-administerable measure of general intellectual ability. For each of 100 words, subjects are asked to select from four choices the word that is closest in meaning to the original word. The score consists of the total number of correct responses. High levels of reliability and concurrent validity are reported in the 1964 manual.

Measure of socioeconomic status. Subjects were asked to provide the occupation of both parents. The SES of the family was determined by using the Revised Duncan Sociometric Index (Stevens & Featherman, 1981).

Results

Nonexperimental Variables

The variables of race (white/black) and residency (urban/rural) had no detectable influence on the results. Based on t-tests these groups did not differ on SRMS, QW, age, SES, or value scores. Based on Chi-square analyses they were not represented disproportionately in the delayed or mature moral reasoning groups. Because of these results, data were collapsed across these variables.

Significant differences on SES were found among the criterion groups. Based on an ANOVA and Newman-Keuls

analyses of SES scoes, mature nondelinquents (47.29), mature delinquents (32.40), and delayed delinquents (26.89) all differed, $F(2,96)=17.64$, $p<.001$. Because of the differences, SES was covaried in many of the analyses.

Significant differences were also found for the QW. Based on an ANOVA and Newman-Keuls analyses, mature nondelinquent had a higher mean QW score (62.26) than the mature delinquents (44.57) and the delayed delinquents (41.02; $F(2,100)=36.05$, $p<.001$), with the mature and delayed delinquents not differing from each other. Because of the differences, QW scores were also covaried in many of the analyses.

As would be expected, ANCOVAs (covarying QW and SES; $F(4.81)=70.08$, $p<.001$) on SRMS for the criterion groups were significant. Based on Newman-Keuls analyses, the mature nondelinquents (312.17), mature delinquents (300.21), and delayed delinquents (242.65) all differed from each other.

Interrater reliability was calculated for the SRM scoring. Twenty randomly selected protocols were scored by the author and a veteran SRM scorer. Based on SRMS, a correlation of .90 ($n=20$, $p<.0001$) was obtained. The mean SRMS discrepency was 11.5. There was exact agreement on modal scores for 75% of the protocols. For global ratings there was 60% exact agreement and 90% agreement within a third of a stage. All of these figures exceed the "minimal

standards" for interrater reliability set forth for SRM scoring (Gibbs and Widaman, 1982).

Values Measures

When the differentiation between mature and delayed moral reasoning was based on modal scores, an ANCOVA (covarying GW and SES) on the Johnson Values Questionnaire score was significant ($F(4,84)=5.60$, $p<.01$). Based on Newman-Keuls analyses the mean scores for mature nondelinquents (5.94), mature delinquents (8.42) and delayed delinquents (11.60) all differed from each other.

The Johnson Values Questionnaire scores correlated significantly with SRMS, $r(N=127)=-.27$, $p<.001$, and GW, $r(N=112)=-.39$, $p<.0001$. The two values measures also correlated with each other $r(N=127)=.50$, $p<.0001$.

ANOVAs and ANCOVAs (covarying GW scores) were run on the scores from the Subterranean Values Questionnaire. These analyses were not significant. Despite the nonsignificant ANOVAS, a 3x2 Chi-square analysis comparing mature delinquents, mature nondelinquents, and delayed delinquents on SVQ scores above or below the median was significant, X^2 (2, $N=118$)=8.92, $p<.01$. 2x2 Chi-square analyses indicated that a greater proportion of delayed delinquents (58%) scored above the median than did mature delinquents (30%), X^2 (1,$n=87$)=6.13, $p<.05$, and mature nondelinquents (32%), X^2 (1, $n=91$)=5.56, $p<.05$. Nondelinquents below global stage 3 were not included in

analyses because of the limited number of subjects (9), but 78% of them scored above the median. A greater percentage of subjects below global stage 3 (61%) scored above the median than did global stage 3 subjects (36%), X^2 (1, N=127)=11.25, p<.001.

MMPI Analyses

Only the delinquent sample completed the MMPI and therefore all analyses compared delayed and mature delinquents. Based on ANCOVAs (covarying GW and SES) no significant differences were found in scaled scores on the three validity scales.

On the Depression scale, Masculinity/Femininity scale, and Repression scale, mature delinquents scored significantly higher than delayed delinquents (see Table 1). On the MacAndrew Alcoholism scale delayed delinquents scored significantly higher than mature delinquents.

Insert Table 1 about here

Eighty-two percent of the mature delinquents and seventy-six percent of the delayed delinquents had scaled scores at or above 70. The MMPI profiles of subjects with a scaled score at or above 70 were examined for the presence or absence of one of the "internalizing" scales (Hs, D, Hy, Mf, Pt, SI) among their two highest scales. A significantly

greater proportion of mature delinquents (83%) had an "internalizing" scale among their two highest scales than did the delayed delinquents (41%).

While the mature delinquents evidenced greater internalizing pathology than delayed delinquents, they also evidenced externalizing pathology. Mature delinquents had mean scores at least one standard deviation above the mean on four internalizing scales and three externalizing scales.

Discussion

Values

A hypothesis tested by this study was that mature delinquents and mature nondelinquents would differ in the content of their values. This hypothesis was supported. The greater acceptance of antisocial behavior by mature delinquents would help to explain why some individuals with age-appropriate moral reasoning engage in antisocial behavior. Cognitive-developmental theories focus on the structure of social cognition and not the content. The current findings offer support to those who believe that when attempting to relate cognitive structures to behavior, content cannot be ignored (Blasi, 1983; Jurkovic, 1980; Kuhn, 1978; Locke, 1983).

This difference in the content of values between mature delinquents and nondelinquents can be explained in a number of ways. Antisocial behavior is inconsistent with stage 3

moral reasoning. Those individuals at stage 3 who engage in antisocial behavior likely experience some cognitive dissonance or strain between their moral structures and their behavior that results in anxiety or guilt. The MMPI results are consistent with this interpretation. One possible way of responding to this anxiety or guilt would be to reduce the structure/behavior strain by embracing values consistent with antisocial behavior. This way the antisocial values serve the defensive purpose of reducing anxiety.

The results are also consistent with the hypothesis that the antisocial values of delinquents are the product of deviant socialization. Similar to Atayal adolescents' beliefs about dreams, mature delinquents' antisocial values may represent "content learning superimposed on a mature cognitive structure " (Kohlberg, 1969; p. 360).

In addition to the link between delinquency and antisocial values, there was also a link between level of moral reasoning and the values that were accepted. Despite this relationship, diverse values were present at each level of moral reasoning. This suggests that although cognitive-developmental theories play an important role in explaining values, and therefore delinquency, they require the input of other approaches to achieve a comprehensive understanding of value acquisition. To further define the relationship between cognitive-structural development,

antisocial values, and delinquency, it would be helpful to study a sample of nondelinquents who are delayed in their moral reasoning. Just as stage 2 moral reasoning does not cause delinquency, but allows for it, it seems probable that stage 2 moral reasoning more easily "allows" for antisocial values and that other factors are involved in actualizing the underlying potential.

MMPI

Mature delinquents exhibited much psychopathology. Eighty-two percent had a score on an MMPI clinical scale at least two standard deviations above the mean. It appears likely that personality functioning or psychopathology is a factor in the antisocial behavior of mature delinquents. This is consistent with the focus of the growing literature that views personality functioning as a mediator between social-cognitive structures and behavior and consistent with those who look to psychopathology to help understand delinquency (Marshall, 1983; Offer, Marohn, & Ostrov, 1979; Weiner, 1970)

Mature delinquents demonstrated both internalizing and externalizing pathology. However, in comparison to delayed delinquents they showed a greater amount of internalizing tendencies or psychopathology. On the Depression, Masculinity/Femininity, and Repression scales, all internalizing scales, mature delinquents scored higher than delayed delinquents. Graham (1979) reports that "Scale 2

[Depression] seems to be an excellent index of an examinee's discomfort and dissatisfaction with his life situation." (p. 36). Moderately high scores are not reflective of clinical depression, but rather of "a general attitude or life style characterized by poor morale and lack of involvement." (p. 36). High scores for males on the Masculinity/Femininity scale suggest a lack of stereotypic masculine interests and possible conflicts in sexual identity and acceptance of the male role. Based on adult norms, mature delinquents were close to the mean on the Repression scale, with the delayed delinquents being below the mean. In general, high scorers are internalizers who are characterized by repression and denial. Low scorers tend to be externalizers who act out.

On the MacAndrews Alcoholism scale, delayed delinquents scored higher than mature delinquents. Adolescent norms are not available and the meaning of the scale for an adolescent population is not clear. The meaning of this difference between delayed and mature delinquents is also limited by the small mean difference in raw scores (see Table 2). While statistically significant, the clinical value of a two-point difference is questionable.

In addition to looking at the means of individual scales, the MMPI results were also examined by code type. The MMPI clinical scales can be divided into those that are associated with the inhibition and control of impulses (Hs, D, Hy, Mf, Pt, Si) and those that are associated with

difficulty with the control of impulses (Pd, Pa, Sc, Ma; Graham, 1979). The Hs, D, and Hy scales, three scales found among the scales associated with the inhibition of impulses, are commonly referred to as the neurotic triad. Hathaway and Monachesi (1963) found scales D, Mf, and Si to be inhibitors of manifest delinquent behaviors and Pd, Sc, and Ma scales to be "excitatory scales" for delinquent behavior.

The classification of MMPI scales into those that reflect the control of impulses and those that reflect the lack of control of impulses is consistent with Achenbach's (1982) broad-band categories of internalizers and externalizers. It is also consistent with the common distinction in child psychopathology between children who internalize and children who act out (Anthony, 1970).

Of the subjects with at least one scaled score at or above 70, a significantly greater proportion of mature delinquents than delayed delinquents had an "internalizing" scale among their two highest scales. This is consistent with the results of the analyses on mean scale scores. These results were anticipated for two reasons. First, the strain between stage 3 moral reasoning and antisocial behavior would suggest a greater amount of anxiety and guilt for the mature delinquents. The results are consistent with this hypothesis. A second reason for anticipating these

results is that internalizing psychopathology is more consistent with stage 3 structures than stage 2 structures.

Stage 2 moral reasoners focus more on external factors in thinking about what is right and wrong. Concrete reciprocity is important. The MMPI results suggest that delayed delinquents are more likely to deal with psychological needs in a similar way. Their psychological functioning appears to tend more toward action than thought. Their focus and energy appears to be directed more externally on behavior, with their feelings being acted on and not reflected on.

Stage 3 moral reasoners, on the other hand, have a greater internal focus. Relationships, mutuality, feelings, and expectations become more salient in thinking about right and wrong. This more internalized frame of reference was also found on the MMPI results. Despite having run into trouble with society for having "acted out", they demonstrated a greater tendency to experience internal conflict and anxiety.

Much of the research exploring the interaction of moral reasoning and personality factors focuses on personality as a mediator between moral judgment and moral action. There is limited research on the relationship of cognitive-developmental structures to types of personality and psychopathology (see Noam et al., 1984). The current results are consistent with the research that has been

conducted (Douglas et al., 1987; Jurkovic & Prentice, 1977; Ruma & Mosher, 1966). Noam et al. (1984) found a positive relationship between Achenbach's externalizing factor and lower levels of ego development in an adolescent psychiatric population. However, unlike the present study, no relationship was found between an internalizing factor and higher levels of ego development.

There is also limited research on the developmental relationship between social-cognitive structures and personality factors. Jurkovic (1980) proposed that certain emotional developments may be necessary for social-cognitive development: "Careful consideration should also be given in future training studies to the importance of affective variables in stage transition, especially from stage 2 to 3 in Kohlberg's framework. To the extent that conventional level reasoning is shaped, at least in part, by a previously acquired sense of trust, a critical mechanism of change may be the development of give and take or functionally reciprocal relationships with others" (p. 719). Noam (1985) related stable personality traits or styles (one focused on individuation and the other on affiliation) to social-cognitive development. These styles are seen as interacting with level of social-cognitive development to either foster or delay development.

The personality or psychopathological differences between delayed and mature delinquents are consistent with a

developmental relationship between these factors. How an internalizing personality style relates to more "internalized" social-cognitive structures is not clear. The relationship could be similar to the one hypothesized by Noam (1985) for individuation versus affiliation personality styles. Internalizing and externalizing personality styles may interact with social-cognitive structures to promote or delay social-cognitive development. However, it is not clear whether internalizing and externalizing personality style are traits that are stable over time or are developmental in nature. It could be that the development of an internalizing personality style in some way parallels social-cognitive development. Or, as with Jurkovic's hypothesis concerning interpersonal trust and social cognitive development, an internalizing personality style may be a prerequisite for the development of mature sociomoral structures.

Kohlberg's theory of the development of sociomoral reasoning studies social functioning primarily from the perspective of social-cognitive structures. While Kohlberg's theory has provided valuable insight into social development and functioning, the current findings suggest that its heuristic and applied value can be maximized by acknowledging its limitations and placing it in its proper relationship to other theories (Gibbs & Schnell, 1985).

References

Achenbach, T. (1982). Developmental psychopathology (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley and Sons.

Blasi, A. (1983). Moral cognition and moral action: A theoretical perspective. Developmental Review, 3, 178-210.

Blasi, A. (1985). The moral personality: Reflections for social science and education. In M. W. Berkowitz & F. Oser (Eds.), Moral education: Theory and application (pp. 433-444). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Borgatta, B., & Corsini, R. (1960). The Quick Word Test. Journal of Educational Research, 54, 15-20.

Butcher, J. N. & Tellegen, A. (1978). Common methodological problems in MMPI research. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 620-628.

Cernkovich, S. A. (1978). Value orientations and delinquency involvement. Criminology, 15, 443-458.

Colby, A. (1978). Evolution of moral-developmental theory. In W. Damon (Ed.), New Direction in child development #2 - Moral development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Colby, A., Kohlberg, L., Gibbs, J., & Lieberman, M. (1983). A longitudinal study of moral judgment. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 48(1, Serial No. 200).

Dobert, R., & Nunner-Winkler, G. (1985). Moral development and personal reliability: The impact of the family on two aspects of moral consciousness in adolescence. In M. W. Berkowitz & F. Oser (Eds.), Moral education: Theory and application (pp.147-173). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Genshaft, J. (1980). Personality characteristics of delinquent subtypes. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 8, 279-283.

Gibbs, J. C., Arnold, K., Ahlborn, H., & Cheesman, F. (1984). Facilitation of sociomoral reasoning in delinquents. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 52, 37-45.

Gibbs, J. C. & Widaman, K. (1982). Social intelligence: Measuring the development of sociomoral reflection. Englewood Cliff, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

Gibbs, J. C., Widaman, K. F., & Colby, A. (1982). Construction and validation of a simplified, group-administerable equivalent to the Moral Judgment Interview. Child Development, 53, 895-910.

Gibbs, J. C. & Schnell, S. (1985). Moral develoment "versus" socialization: A critique. American Psychologist, 40, 1071-1080.

Graham, J. R. (1979). The MMPI: A practical guide. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gynther, M. D. (1961). The clinical utility of "invalid" MMPI scores. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 25, 540-542.

Haan, N. (1978). Two moralities in action context: Relationships to thought, ego regulation, and development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 286-305.

Hathaway, S. R., & Monachesi, E. D. (1961). An atlas of juvenile MMPI profiles. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Jennings, W., Kilkenny, R., & Kohlberg, L. (1983). Moral-developmental theory and practice for youthful and adult offenders. In W. Laufer & J. Day (Eds.), Personality theory, moral development, and criminal behavior(pp. 281-356). Lexington, Ma.: Lexington Books.

Johnson, R. (1979). Juvenile delinquency and its origins. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jurkovic, G. (1980). The juvenile delinquent as a moral philosopher: A structural-developmental perspective. Psychological Bulletin, 88, 709-727.

Jurkovic, G. & Prentice, N. (1977). Relation of moral and cognitive development to dimensions of juvenile delinquency. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 86, 414-420.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization theory. In D. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research (pp. 347-480). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Kohlberg, L., & Kramer, R. (1969). Continuities and discontinuities in childhood and adult moral development. Human Development, 12, 93-120.

Kohlberg, L., Levine, C., & Hewer, A. (1983). Moral stages: A current formulation and a response to critics. Basel(Switzerland): Karger.

Kuhn, D. (1978). Mechanisms of cognitive and social development: One psychology or two? Human Development, 21, 92-118.

Lanyon, R. (1968). A handbook of MMPI profiles. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Locke, D. (1983). Doing what comes morally: The relation between behavior and stages of moral reasoning. Human Development, 26, 540-542.

MacAndrew, C. (1965). The differentiation of male alcoholic outpatients from nonalcoholic psychiatric outpatients by means of the MMPI. Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 26, 238-246.

Marks, P. M., Seeman, W. & Haller, D. L. (1974). The actuarial use of the MMPI with adolescents and adults. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins.

Marshall, R. (1983). A psychoanalytic perspective on the diagnosis and development of juvenile delinquency. In W. Laufer & J. Day (Eds.), Personality theory, moral development, and criminal behavior(pp. 119-). Lexington, Ma.: Lexington Books.

McKegney, F. P. (1965). An item analysis of the MMPI F scale in juvenile delinquents. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 21, 201-205.

Noam, G. (1985). Stage, phase, and style: The developmental dynamics of the self. In M. W. Berkowitz & F. Oser (Eds.). Moral education: Theory and application (pp. 321-346). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawwrence Erlbaum.

Noam, G. G., Hauser, S. T., Santostefano, S., Garrison, W., Jacobson, A. M., Powers, S. I., & Mead, M. (1984). Ego development and psychopathology: A study of hospitalized adolescents. Child Development, 55, 184-194.

Offer, D., Marohn, R., & Ostrov, E. (1979). The psychological world of the juvenile delinquent. New York: Basic Books.

Ruma, E. H. & Mosher, D. L. (1967). Relationship between moral judgment and guilt in delinquent boys. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 72, 122-127.

Segrave, J. O. & Hastad, D. N. (1983). Evaluating structural and control models of delinquency causation: A replication and extension. Youth and Society, 14, 437-456.

Selman, R. L. (1980). The growth of interpersonal understanding: Developmental and clinical analyses. New York: Academic Press.

Selman, R. L. & Demorest, A. P. (1984). Observing troubled children's interpersonal negotiation strategies: Implications of and for a developmental model. Child Development, 55, 288-304.

Stevens, G. & Featherman, D. L. (1981). A revised socioeconomic index of occupational status. Social Science Research, 10, 364-395.

Villenave-Cremer, S., & Eckensberger, L. H. (1985). The role of affective processes in moral judgment performance. In M. W. Berkowitz & F. Oser (Eds.), Moral education: Theory and application (pp. 175-194). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ward, L. & Wilson, J. P. (1980). Motivation and moral development as determinants of behavioral acquiescence and moral action. Journal of Social Psychology, 112, 271-286.

Waterman, J. M., Sobesky, W. E., Silvern, L., Aoki, B., & McCaulay, M. (1981). Social perspective-taking and adjustment in emotionally disturbed, learning-disabled, and normal children. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 9, 133-148.

Weiner, I. (1970). Psychological disturbance in adolescence. New York: Wiley.

Welsh, G. S. (1956). Factor dimensions A and R. In G. S. Welsh & W. G. Dahlstrom (Eds.). Basic readings on the MMPI in psychology and medicine (pp. 264-281). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Table 1

Mean Scaled Scores for Delinquent Subjects on MMPI Scales

Scale	Delayed Delinquents (n=59)	Mature Delinquents (n=28)	df	F
L	48.2	48.6	3,52	.20
F	68.1	70.3	3,52	.72
K	44.5	47.5	3,52	.73
Hs	60.0	63.9	3,52	.61
D	53.5	60.5	3,52	6.92*
Hy	55.8	57.3	3,52	.33
Pd	64.3	65.1	3,52	.01
Mf	56.1	62.4	3,52	5.28*
Pa	60.4	58.6	3,52	.14
Pt	63.6	62.3	3,52	.01
Sc	64.5	63.6	3,52	.01
Ma	67.5	64.3	3,52	1.19
Si	49.9	51.9	3,52	1.45
Anx	21.2^	19.3^	3,52	.20
R	12.8^	15.9^	3,52	7.64**
Es	37.5^	36.2^	3,52	1.55
Mac	30.6^	28.9^	3,52	8.35**

Note. ^ indicates raw scores.
* significant at $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$.